

United States Patent and Trademark Office

	ł	1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COM United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov	ME	RCI

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/018,293 12/18/2001 Masanori Ayabe 350292001100 1682 EXAMINER 25227 04/08/2005 **MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP** HAAS, WENDY C 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER SUITE 300 MCLEAN, VA 22102 1661

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	 		
Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/018,293	AYABE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wendy C Haas	1661	•
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated at the control of the control o	ation. A proper reply	y to a tion in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the seminary of th	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF f extension and the corresponding amo	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appro	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	e later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b).	ling date of the final rejec	ction, even if
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>18 March 2005</u>. App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	in the period set fort f the appeal.	h in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
NOTE: the new recitation of ordered steps in clair	m 1 would require further search		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi 	dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a)∏ will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided belo	⊠ will be entered a w or appended.	nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-5.		,	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		/ 1 4	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>			
Peterners V/met 4/1/5	AMP	REW WANG	
	SUPERVISOR	NEW WARD PATENT EXAMINER REY CENTER 1600	

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's remarks/arguments are confusing. Specifically, applicant's arguments refer to the Ayabe reference as a "shoot-tip" culture method, while the cited reference is not directed to "shoot-tip" culture. As such, the Examiner is unable to follow the remainder of the arguments.